
Draft

Environmental Impact Statement

**for the Construction and Operation of an
Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation
on the Reservation of the Skull Valley Band
of Goshute Indians and the Related Transportation
Facility in Tooele County, Utah**

Docket No. 72-22
Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Surface Transportation Board

June 2000



Draft

Environmental Impact Statement

**for the Construction and Operation of an Independent Spent Fuel Storage
Installation on the Reservation of the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
and the Related Transportation Facility in Tooele County, Utah**

Docket No. 72-22
Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

U.S. Surface Transportation Board

June 2000



ABSTRACT

Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C. (PFS), proposes to construct and operate an independent spent fuel storage installation on the Reservation of the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians. The Reservation is located geographically within Skull Valley in Tooele County, Utah. Spent nuclear fuel would be transported by rail from existing power reactor sites to Skull Valley. To transport the spent nuclear fuel from the existing rail line in Skull Valley to the proposed independent spent fuel storage installation, PFS proposes to construct and operate a rail siding and 51-km (32-mile) rail line from Skunk Ridge (near Low, Utah) to the Reservation.

This draft environmental impact statement evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the PFS proposal. The document discusses the purpose and need for the PFS proposal, describes the proposed action and its reasonable alternatives, describes the environment potentially affected by the proposal, presents and compares the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed action and its alternatives, and identifies mitigation measures that could eliminate or lessen the potential environmental impacts.

The PFS proposal requires approval from four federal agencies: the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the U.S. Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Surface Transportation Board. The actions required of these agencies are administrative. The environmental issues that each of these agencies must evaluate pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) are interrelated; therefore, the agencies have cooperated in the preparation of this draft environmental impact statement, and this document serves to satisfy each agency's statutory responsibilities under NEPA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF TABLES	xxi
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xxv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xxix
1. PURPOSE AND NEED	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-1
1.2 The Proposed Action	1-1
1.3 Need for the Proposed Action	1-6
1.4 Scoping Process	1-11
1.5 Cooperating Agencies	1-14
1.5.1 NRC Federal Action	1-14
1.5.2 BIA Federal Action	1-15
1.5.3 BLM Federal Action	1-15
1.5.4 STB Federal Action	1-16
1.5.5 Required Agency Consultation	1-16
1.6 Federal, Tribal and State Authorities, Regulations, and Permits	1-18
1.6.1 Statutes and Regulations	1-18
1.6.1.1 Federal Laws and Regulations	1-18
1.6.1.2 Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians Tribal Statutes and Regulations	1-21
1.6.1.3 State of Utah Statutes and Regulations	1-21
1.6.2 Required Permits and Approvals	1-21
1.6.2.1 Federal Permits and Approvals	1-21
1.6.2.2 Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians Tribal Permits and Approvals	1-23
1.6.2.3 State of Utah Permits and Approvals for Activities Off the Reservation	1-23
2. ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION	2-1
2.1 Proposed Action	2-1
2.1.1 Proposed Site and Description of Associated Facilities	2-1
2.1.1.1 Site Description	2-1
2.1.1.2 Facility Description	2-3
2.1.1.3 New Rail Line	2-12
2.1.1.4 Land Use Requirements	2-15

2.1.2	Operation	2-15
2.1.2.1	Transportation of Spent Fuel to the Proposed PFSF	2-16
2.1.2.2	Proposed Storage Cask System	2-22
2.1.3	Emissions, Effluents, and Solid Wastes	2-23
2.1.4	Best Management Practices	2-26
2.1.5	Monitoring Programs	2-28
2.1.6	Facility Closure and Decommissioning	2-28
2.1.6.1	Storage Cask Decommissioning	2-29
2.1.6.2	Storage Pad Decommissioning	2-30
2.1.6.3	Decommissioning of Buildings, Structures, and Other Improvements	2-30
2.2	Alternatives	2-31
2.2.1	Alternatives to the Proposed PFSF (Not Addressed Further in this DEIS)	2-31
2.2.1.1	A Different Privately Owned ISFSI	2-31
2.2.1.2	Shipment of SNF Between Reactor Sites	2-31
2.2.1.3	Alternatives That, in Effect, Eliminate the Need for the Proposed PFSF	2-32
2.2.2	Alternative Technology	2-32
2.2.2.1	Dry Storage Systems	2-32
2.2.2.2	Wet Storage Systems	2-33
2.2.3	Alternative Sites	2-33
2.2.3.1	Site A at the Reservation	2-33
2.2.3.2	Site B at the Reservation	2-34
2.2.3.3	Fremont County, Wyoming, Site	2-34
2.2.4	Transportation Options	2-34
2.2.4.1	National Transportation Options	2-34
2.2.4.2	Local Transportation Options (in Skull Valley)	2-34
2.2.5	No-Action Alternative	2-43
3.	POTENTIALLY AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT IN SKULL VALLEY, UTAH	3-1
3.1	Geology, Minerals, and Soils	3-1
3.1.1	Geology	3-1
3.1.2	Seismic Setting	3-3
3.1.3	Soils	3-3
3.1.4	Mineral Resources	3-5
3.2	Water Resources	3-6
3.2.1	Surface Water Hydrology and Quality	3-6
3.2.1.1	General Site Setting	3-6
3.2.1.2	Flooding	3-11
3.2.2	Groundwater Hydrology and Quality	3-11
3.2.3	Water Use	3-12
3.3	Climate and Air Quality	3-14
3.3.1	Climate	3-14
3.3.2	Air Quality	3-17
3.4	Ecological Resources	3-20
3.4.1	Terrestrial Resources	3-21

3.4.1.1	Vegetation	3-21
3.4.1.2	Wildlife	3-23
3.4.2	Aquatic Resources	3-26
3.4.2.1	Perennial and Ephemeral Streams	3-26
3.4.2.2	Wetlands	3-26
3.4.3	Threatened, Endangered, and Other Species of Special Concern	3-28
3.4.3.1	Plants	3-28
3.4.3.2	Wildlife	3-30
3.5	Socioeconomic and Community Resources	3-34
3.5.1	The Reservation	3-35
3.5.2	Tooele County and Communities	3-36
3.5.2.1	Land Use	3-36
3.5.2.2	Population	3-38
3.5.2.3	Employment and Economic Resources	3-39
3.5.2.4	Community Resources	3-42
3.6	Cultural Resources	3-44
3.6.1	Cultural Background	3-44
3.6.2	Archaeological, Native American, and Historic Properties	3-48
3.6.2.1	Archaeological Properties	3-48
3.6.2.2	Native American Properties	3-51
3.6.2.3	Historic Properties	3-52
3.7	Background Radiological Characteristics	3-54
3.8	Other Environmental Features	3-58
3.8.1	Ambient Noise Levels	3-58
3.8.2	Scenic Qualities	3-58
3.8.3	Recreation	3-61
4.	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF CONSTRUCTING AND OPERATING THE PROPOSED PFSF	4-1
4.1	Geology and Soils	4-2
4.1.1	Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)	4-2
4.1.2	Impacts During Operations at the Preferred Site	4-3
4.1.3	The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	4-4
4.1.4	Mitigation Measures	4-4
4.2	Water Resources	4-4
4.2.1	Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)	4-5
4.2.1.1	Surface Water	4-5
4.2.1.2	Water Use	4-7
4.2.1.3	Groundwater	4-7
4.2.2	Impacts During Operations at the Preferred Site	4-9
4.2.2.1	Surface Water	4-9
4.2.2.2	Potential Impacts Related to Flooding	4-10
4.2.2.3	Water Use	4-11
4.2.2.4	Groundwater	4-12
4.2.3	The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	4-12
4.2.4	Mitigation Measures	4-13
4.3	Air Quality	4-13
4.3.1	Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)	4-14
4.3.2	Impacts During Operations at the Preferred Site	4-16

4.3.3	The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	4-16
4.3.4	Mitigation Measures	4-16
4.4	Ecological Resources	4-17
4.4.1	Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)	4-17
4.4.1.1	Vegetation	4-17
4.4.1.2	Wildlife	4-19
4.4.1.3	Wetlands	4-20
4.4.2	Impacts During Operations at the Preferred Site	4-20
4.4.2.1	Vegetation	4-20
4.4.2.2	Wildlife	4-21
4.4.2.3	Wetlands	4-23
4.4.3	Impacts to Threatened, Endangered, and Other Species of Special Concern	4-23
4.4.3.1	Plants	4-23
4.4.3.2	Wildlife	4-24
4.4.4	The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	4-24
4.4.5	Mitigation Measures	4-25
4.4.5.1	Vegetation	4-25
4.4.5.2	Wildlife	4-26
4.5	Socioeconomics and Community Resources	4-27
4.5.1	Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)	4-28
4.5.1.1	Population	4-30
4.5.1.2	Housing	4-30
4.5.1.3	Education	4-30
4.5.1.4	Utilities	4-31
4.5.1.5	Solid and Sanitary Wastes	4-31
4.5.1.6	Transportation and Traffic	4-31
4.5.1.7	Land Use	4-32
4.5.1.8	Economic Structure	4-32
4.5.2	Impacts During Operations at the Preferred Site	4-32
4.5.2.1	Population	4-34
4.5.2.2	Housing	4-34
4.5.2.3	Education	4-34
4.5.2.4	Utilities	4-35
4.5.2.5	Solid and Sanitary Wastes	4-35
4.5.2.6	Transportation and Traffic	4-35
4.5.2.7	Land Use	4-35
4.5.2.8	Economic Structure	4-35
4.5.3	The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	4-36
4.5.4	Mitigation Measures	4-36
4.6	Cultural Resources	4-37
4.6.1	Construction Impacts at the Preferred Site (Site A)	4-37
4.6.2	Impacts During Operations at the Preferred Site	4-37
4.6.3	Native American Cultural Resources	4-38
4.6.4	The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	4-38
4.6.5	Mitigation Measures	4-38
4.7	Human Health Impacts	4-39
4.7.1	Non-Radiological Impacts at the Proposed Site (Site A)	4-39
4.7.1.1	Potential Worker Injuries During Construction	4-40

4.7.1.2	Potential Worker Injuries During Operations	4-41
4.7.2	Radiological Impacts at the Proposed Site (Site A)	4-41
4.7.2.1	Estimated Dose to the General Public	4-42
4.7.2.2	Estimated Dose to Occupational Personnel	4-44
4.7.2.3	Estimated Doses from Off-Normal Operations and Accidents	4-45
4.7.3	Impacts at the Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	4-48
4.7.4	Mitigation Measures	4-48
4.8	Other Impacts	4-49
4.8.1	Noise	4-49
4.8.1.1	Noise During Construction	4-49
4.8.1.2	Noise During Operations	4-50
4.8.2	Scenic Qualities	4-50
4.8.2.1	BLM Perspective	4-50
4.8.2.2	The Staff Analysis	4-51
4.8.2.3	Recreational Viewers	4-51
4.8.2.4	Local Residential Viewers	4-51
4.8.2.5	Motorists on Skull Valley Road	4-59
4.8.2.6	The Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	4-59
4.8.2.7	Conclusions Regarding Visual Qualities	4-59
4.8.2.8	Mitigation Measures	4-59
4.8.3	Recreation	4-59
4.9	Decommissioning and Closure	4-61
4.9.1	Geology and Soils	4-62
4.9.2	Surface Water and Groundwater	4-62
4.9.3	Air Quality	4-63
4.9.4	Ecological Resources	4-63
4.9.5	Socioeconomic and Community Resources	4-64
4.9.6	Cultural Resources	4-64
4.9.7	Human Health	4-64
4.9.8	Noise	4-64
4.9.9	Scenic Qualities	4-64
4.9.10	Recreation	4-65
5.	TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	5-1
5.1	Geology, Minerals, and Soils	5-2
5.1.1	Construction Impacts	5-2
5.1.1.1	New Rail Line from Skunk Ridge	5-3
5.1.1.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-3
5.1.2	Impacts During Operations	5-4
5.1.2.1	New Rail Line from Skunk Ridge	5-4
5.1.2.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-4
5.1.3	Impacts at the Alternative Site B	5-5
5.1.3.1	New Rail Line from Skunk Ridge	5-5
5.1.3.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-5
5.1.4	Mitigation Measures	5-5
5.1.4.1	New Rail Line from Skunk Ridge	5-5
5.1.4.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-5
5.2	Water Resources	5-5
5.2.1	Construction Impacts	5-5

5.2.1.1	Surface Water	5-5
5.2.1.2	Potential Impacts of Flooding	5-6
5.2.1.3	Water Use	5-7
5.2.1.4	Groundwater	5-8
5.2.2	Impacts During Operations	5-8
5.2.2.1	Surface Water	5-8
5.2.2.2	Potential Impacts of Flooding	5-9
5.2.2.3	Water Use	5-10
5.2.2.4	Groundwater	5-10
5.2.3	Impacts at the Alternative Site (Site B)	5-10
5.2.4	Mitigation Measures	5-10
5.3	Air Quality	5-11
5.3.1	Construction Impacts	5-11
5.3.1.1	New Rail Line from Skunk Ridge	5-11
5.3.1.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-12
5.3.2	Impacts During Operations	5-12
5.3.2.1	New Rail Line from Skunk Ridge	5-12
5.3.2.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-13
5.3.3	Impacts at the Alternative Site B	5-13
5.3.3.1	Construction Impacts	5-13
5.3.3.2	Impacts During Operations	5-13
5.3.4	Mitigation Measures	5-13
5.3.4.1	Construction Impacts	5-13
5.3.4.2	Impacts During Operations	5-14
5.4	Ecological Resources	5-14
5.4.1	Construction Impacts	5-14
5.4.1.1	Vegetation	5-14
5.4.1.2	Wildlife	5-15
5.4.1.3	Wetlands	5-16
5.4.1.4	Perennial and Ephemeral Streams	5-16
5.4.1.5	Threatened and Endangered Species and Other Species of Special Concern	5-16
5.4.2	Impacts During Operations	5-17
5.4.2.1	Vegetation	5-17
5.4.2.2	Wildlife	5-18
5.4.2.3	Wetlands	5-18
5.4.2.4	Perennial and Ephemeral Streams	5-18
5.4.2.5	Threatened and Endangered Species and Other Species of Special Concern	5-18
5.4.3	Impacts at the Alternative Site B	5-19
5.4.3.1	Vegetation	5-19
5.4.3.2	Wildlife	5-19
5.4.3.3	Wetlands	5-19
5.4.3.4	Perennial and Ephemeral Streams	5-19
5.4.3.5	Threatened and Endangered Species and Other Species of Special Concern	5-19
5.4.4	Mitigation Measures	5-19
5.4.4.1	Vegetation	5-19
5.4.4.2	Wildlife	5-20

5.5	Socioeconomic and Community Resources	5-21
5.5.1	Construction Impacts	5-22
5.5.1.1	New Rail Line from Skunk Ridge	5-22
5.5.1.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-25
5.5.2	Impacts During Operations	5-27
5.5.2.1	New Rail Line From Skunk Ridge	5-27
5.5.2.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-28
5.5.3	Impacts at the Alternative Site B	5-28
5.5.4	Mitigation Measures	5-28
5.6	Cultural Resources	5-29
5.6.1	Construction Impacts	5-29
5.6.1.1	New Rail Line from Skunk Ridge	5-29
5.6.1.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-30
5.6.2	Impacts During Operations	5-31
5.6.3	Impacts at the Alternative Site B	5-31
5.6.4	Native American Cultural Resources	5-31
5.6.5	Mitigation Measures	5-31
5.7	Human Health Impacts of SNF Transportation	5-32
5.7.1	Non-Radiological Impacts	5-32
5.7.1.1	Potential Worker Injuries During Construction and Operation of Transportation Facilities	5-32
5.7.1.2	Rail Traffic Accidents	5-34
5.7.1.3	Latent Health Effects	5-35
5.7.2	Radiological Impacts	5-36
5.7.2.1	Summary of Findings	5-37
5.7.2.2	Approach to Analysis	5-38
5.7.2.3	Assumptions for this Analysis as Compared to NUREG-0170	5-39
5.7.2.4	Incident-Free and Accident Dose Risks from SNF Shipments to the Proposed PFSF	5-44
5.7.2.5	Incident-Free and Accident Dose Risks from Shipments to a Final Repository	5-49
5.7.2.6	Utah and Regional Impacts	5-52
5.7.2.7	Sabotage	5-53
5.7.2.8	Conclusion	5-53
5.7.3	Mitigation Measures	5-54
5.8	Other Impacts	5-54
5.8.1	Noise	5-54
5.8.1.1	Construction Impacts	5-54
5.8.1.2	Impacts During Operations	5-54
5.8.1.3	ITF and Use of Skull Valley Road	5-55
5.8.1.4	Alternative Site B	5-55
5.8.1.5	Mitigation Measures	5-55
5.8.2	Scenic Qualities	5-56
5.8.2.1	Recreational Viewers	5-56
5.8.2.2	Local Residential Viewers	5-56
5.8.2.3	Motorists on Interstate 80	5-58
5.8.2.4	Mitigation Measures	5-58
5.8.3	Recreation	5-58
5.8.3.1	Construction Impacts	5-58

5.8.3.2	Impacts During Operations	5-61
5.8.3.3	Alternative Site B	5-62
5.8.3.4	Mitigation Measures	5-62
5.8.4	Wildfires	5-62
5.8.4.1	Mitigation Measures	5-64
5.9	Decommissioning	5-64
5.9.1	Skunk Ridge Rail Line Corridor	5-64
5.9.2	New ITF Near Timpie	5-65
5.9.3	Potential Worker Injuries During Decommissioning	5-65
6.	SUMMARY OF IMPACTS	6-1
6.1	Impacts of the Proposed Action and Its Alternatives	6-1
6.1.1	Geology, Minerals, and Soils	6-1
6.1.1.1	Impacts of Alternative 1	6-3
6.1.1.2	Impacts of Alternative 2	6-4
6.1.1.3	Impacts of Alternative 3	6-4
6.1.1.4	Impacts of Alternative 4	6-4
6.1.2	Water Resources	6-4
6.1.2.1	Impacts of Alternative 1	6-4
6.1.2.2	Impacts of Alternative 2	6-5
6.1.2.3	Impacts of Alternative 3	6-5
6.1.2.4	Impacts of Alternative 4	6-6
6.1.3	Air Quality	6-6
6.1.3.1	Impacts of Alternative 1	6-6
6.1.3.2	Impacts of Alternative 2	6-6
6.1.3.3	Impacts of Alternative 3	6-6
6.1.3.4	Impacts of Alternative 4	6-7
6.1.4	Ecological Resources	6-7
6.1.4.1	Impacts of Alternative 1	6-7
6.1.4.2	Impacts of Alternative 2	6-9
6.1.4.3	Impacts of Alternative 3	6-10
6.1.4.4	Impacts of Alternative 4	6-10
6.1.5	Socioeconomics and Community Resources	6-10
6.1.5.1	Impacts of Alternative 1	6-11
6.1.5.2	Impacts of Alternative 2	6-12
6.1.5.3	Impacts of Alternative 3	6-12
6.1.5.4	Impacts of Alternative 4	6-14
6.1.6	Cultural Resources	6-14
6.1.6.1	Impacts of Alternative 1	6-14
6.1.6.2	Impacts of Alternative 2	6-15
6.1.6.3	Impacts of Alternative 3	6-15
6.1.6.4	Impacts of Alternative 4	6-15
6.1.7	Human Health Impacts	6-15
6.1.7.1	Impacts of Alternative 1	6-15
6.1.7.2	Impacts of Alternative 2	6-16
6.1.7.3	Impacts of Alternative 3	6-16
6.1.7.4	Impacts of Alternative 4	6-18
6.1.8	Other Impacts	6-18
6.1.8.1	Noise	6-18

6.1.8.2	Scenic Qualities	6-19
6.1.8.3	Recreation	6-19
6.2	Environmental Justice	6-20
6.2.1	Impacts of Alternative 1	6-22
6.2.1.1	Demographics	6-22
6.2.1.2	Assessment of Impacts	6-27
6.2.2	Impacts of Alternative 2	6-31
6.2.3	Impacts of Alternative 3	6-32
6.2.4	Impacts of Alternative 4	6-32
6.3	Cumulative Impacts	6-32
6.3.1	Geology, Minerals, and Soils	6-32
6.3.2	Water Resources	6-33
6.3.3	Air Quality	6-33
6.3.4	Ecological Resources	6-34
6.3.5	Socioeconomic and Community Resources	6-35
6.3.6	Cultural Resources	6-36
6.3.7	Human Health Impacts	6-36
6.3.8	Other Impacts	6-37
6.3.9	Environmental Justice	6-38
6.4	Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts	6-38
6.4.1	Geology, Minerals, and Soils	6-39
6.4.2	Water Resources	6-39
6.4.3	Air Quality	6-39
6.4.4	Ecological Resources	6-39
6.4.5	Socioeconomics and Community Resources	6-40
6.4.6	Cultural Resources	6-40
6.4.7	Human Health Impacts	6-40
6.4.8	Other Impacts	6-40
6.4.8.1	Noise	6-40
6.4.8.2	Scenic Qualities	6-41
6.4.8.3	Recreation	6-41
6.4.9	Environmental Justice	6-41
6.5	Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity	6-41
6.6	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	6-42
6.7	Potential Impacts of the No-Action Alternative	6-43
6.7.1	Geology, Minerals, and Soils	6-45
6.7.2	Water Resources	6-45
6.7.3	Air Quality	6-45
6.7.4	Ecological Resources	6-45
6.7.5	Socioeconomic and Community Resources	6-45
6.7.6	Cultural Resources	6-46
6.7.7	Human Health Impacts	6-46
6.7.8	Other Impacts	6-46
6.7.8.1	Noise	6-46
6.7.8.2	Scenic Qualities	6-46
6.7.8.3	Recreation	6-46
6.7.9	Environmental Justice	6-47

7.	EVALUATION OF AN ALTERNATIVE SITE IN WYOMING	7-1
7.1	Site Selection Process	7-1
7.2	Characteristics of the Wyoming Site	7-5
7.3	Impacts of Constructing and Operating an SNF Storage Facility at the Wyoming Site	7-8
7.3.1	Geology, Minerals, and Soils	7-8
7.3.2	Water Resources	7-9
7.3.3	Air Quality	7-9
7.3.4	Ecological Resources	7-10
7.3.5	Socioeconomic and Community Resources	7-12
7.3.6	Cultural Resources	7-13
7.3.7	Human Health Impacts	7-14
7.3.8	Other Impacts	7-14
7.3.8.1	Noise	7-14
7.3.8.2	Scenic Qualities	7-14
7.3.8.3	Recreation	7-15
7.4	Impacts of Constructing and Operating SNF Transportation Facilities Near the Wyoming Site	7-15
7.4.1	Ecological Resources	7-15
7.4.2	Human Health Impacts	7-16
7.4.2.1	Non-Radiological Impacts	7-16
7.4.2.2	Radiological Impacts	7-18
7.5	Environmental Justice Considerations Near the Wyoming Site	7-20
7.5.1	Demographics	7-22
7.5.1.1	Minority Populations	7-22
7.5.1.2	Low-Income Populations	7-27
7.5.2	Assessment of Impacts	7-29
7.6	Comparison of the Skull Valley, Utah, and Wyoming Sites	7-29
8.	BENEFITS AND COSTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	8-1
8.1	Economic Benefits and Costs of Constructing and Operating the Proposed Facility	8-1
8.1.1	PFS's Model and Assumptions	8-2
8.1.1.1	Projection of Spent Fuel Generation and Additional Storage Requirements	8-2
8.1.1.2	Spent Fuel Acceptance Assumptions	8-2
8.1.1.3	Estimating Costs	8-3
8.1.1.4	Discounting	8-4
8.1.1.5	PFS's Cost Assumptions	8-4
8.1.2	Results	8-5
8.1.2.1	Discussion of Key Assumptions and Sensitivity Analysis	8-7
8.1.2.2	The Effects of the National Repository's Opening Date	8-7
8.1.2.3	The Effects of Discounting	8-7
8.1.2.4	Annual Post-Shutdown Pool Storage Costs	8-7
8.1.2.5	On-Site Costs for Additional Spent Fuel Storage	8-9
8.1.2.6	Costs for the Proposed PFSF	8-9
8.1.2.7	Quantity of Spent Fuel Accepted at the Proposed PFSF	8-9
8.1.3	Conclusion	8-9
8.2	Environmental Benefits and Costs	8-10

8.2.1	Environmental Benefits of the Proposed Action	8-10
8.2.2	Environmental Costs of the Proposed Action	8-10
8.3	Other Societal Benefits and Costs	8-11
9.	COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	9-1
9.1	Introduction	9-1
9.2	Federal Actions Covered in this DEIS	9-1
9.2.1	NRC Action	9-1
9.2.2	BIA Action	9-1
9.2.3	BLM Action	9-2
9.2.4	STB Action	9-2
9.3	Comparison of Potential Impacts	9-2
9.4	Conclusions of the Cooperating Agencies	9-3
9.4.1	Summary of Potential Impacts	9-3
9.4.1.1	The Proposed Action	9-3
9.4.1.2	The Proposed Site (Site A) Versus the Alternative Site (Site B) in Skull Valley	9-6
9.4.1.3	The ITF Transportation Option	9-7
9.4.1.4	The Wyoming Alternative	9-7
9.4.1.5	The No-Action Alternative	9-8
9.4.2	Mitigation Measures	9-9
9.4.3	Staff's Recommendation of the Preferred Alternative	9-13
10.	AGENCIES CONSULTED	10-1
11.	LIST OF PREPARERS AND COOPERATING AGENCY REVIEWERS	11-1
11.1	Preparers	11-1
11.2	Reviewers	11-3
12.	REFERENCES	12-1
13.	INDEX	13-1
	APPENDIX A: SCOPING FOR THIS DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	A-1
	APPENDIX B: CONSULTATION LETTERS	B-1
	APPENDIX C: RAIL ROUTES TO THE PROPOSED PFSF SITE	C-1
	APPENDIX D: TRANSPORTATION RISKS ANALYSIS	D-1
	APPENDIX E: CENSUS BUREAU DATA AS USED IN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSES	E-1
	APPENDIX F: SITE SELECTION/EVALUATION FORMS	F-1

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
Figure ES.1 The proposed project area in Skull Valley, Utah	xxxi
Figure 1.1 Regional location of Skull Valley in Utah	1-2
Figure 1.2 The proposed project area in Skull Valley, Utah	1-3
Figure 1.3 Reactors which are owned by the PFSF companies	1-4
Figure 1.4 Projected loss of full core offload capability for U.S. commercial nuclear reactors	1-8
Figure 1.5 Operating spent fuel storage sites (i.e., ISFSIs) as of April 2000	1-10
Figure 2.1 Location of the proposed site (i.e., Site A) for the PFSF on the Reservation	2-2
Figure 2.2 Basic site plan and layout of structures and facilities at the proposed PFSF	2-4
Figure 2.3 Storage pad detail	2-7
Figure 2.4 Basic site plan and layout for the proposed rail siding near Skunk Ridge, Utah	2-13
Figure 2.5 Typical cross-section for proposed new rail corridor	2-15
Figure 2.6 Sequences of canister handling and transfer operations for the movement of spent nuclear fuel from existing reactor sites	2-17
Figure 2.7 Potential rail routes for shipping spent nuclear fuel to Skull Valley, Utah	2-18
Figure 2.8 Transfer operations for spent nuclear fuel assemblies (inside sealed canisters) at the proposed PFSF	2-20
Figure 2.9 Type of storage cask transporter proposed for use at the PFSF	2-21
Figure 2.10 HOLTEC Hi-Storm® storage cask	2-24
Figure 2.11 Alternative site (i.e., Site B) for the proposed PFSF on the Reservation	2-35
Figure 2.12 Location of an alternative ISFSI site in Fremont County, Wyoming	2-36
Figure 2.13 Proposed location of an Intermodal Transfer Facility in Skull Valley	2-38
Figure 2.14 Basic site plan and layout for the Intermodal Transfer Facility	2-39
Figure 2.15 Typical heavy-haul tractor/trailer rig used for transporting spent nuclear fuel shipping casks	2-41
Figure 2.16 Alternative route for a new road in the western portion of Skull Valley	2-44
Figure 3.1 Mapped and interpreted surface and subsurface structural features in the immediate area of the proposed site	3-4
Figure 3.2 Locations of potential sources of construction aggregate in Skull Valley	3-7
Figure 3.3 Drainage channels and soils/surficial geology in Skull Valley	3-10
Figure 3.4 Location of water wells within 8 km (5 miles) of the proposed PFSF	3-13
Figure 3.5 Wind roses for Salt Lake City and for the location near the Pony Express convenience store in Skull Valley	3-16

Figure 3.6	Vegetative micro-communities on the proposed PFSF site (Site A) and the alternative site (Site B) on the Reservation	3-22
Figure 3.7	Critical mule deer habitat within Skull Valley	3-24
Figure 3.8	Location of major springs in Skull Valley	3-27
Figure 3.9	Winter roost sites for bald eagles in Skull Valley	3-31
Figure 3.10	View from the proposed PFSF site looking east toward the Stansbury Mountains	3-59
Figure 3.11	View from Skull Valley Road looking west toward the Cedar Mountains	3-60
Figure 3.12	Wilderness study areas and unit areas recently inventoried for their wilderness characteristics	3-62
Figure 4.1	Estimated water use during construction of the proposed PFSF	4-8
Figure 4.2	Visual impact identified worksheet	4-52
Figure 4.3	Artist's rendering of the daytime view of the proposed PFSF from Deseret Peak	4-54
Figure 4.4	Artist's rendering of the nighttime view of the proposed PFSF from Deseret Peak	4-55
Figure 4.5	Artist's rendering of the daytime view of the proposed PFSF from Skull Valley Road	4-56
Figure 4.6	Artist's rendering of the daytime view of the proposed PFSF from the Goshute Tribal village	4-57
Figure 4.7	Artist's rendering of the nighttime view of the proposed PFSF from the Goshute Tribal village	4-58
Figure 4.8	Artist's rendering of the nighttime view of the proposed PFSF from Skull Valley road	4-60
Figure 5.1	Rail route from the Maine Yankee nuclear power plant to the proposed PFSF in Skull Valley, Utah	5-41
Figure 5.2	Rail route for shipping SNF from Skull Valley, Utah, toward a national repository	5-42
Figure 5.3	Artist's rendering of the proposed Skunk Ridge rail line as viewed from the Cedar Mountains	5-57
Figure 5.4	Artist's rendering of the proposed Skunk Ridge rail line as viewed from the Interstate 80 off-ramp at the Low interchange	5-59
Figure 5.5	Artist's rendering of the proposed Intermodal Transfer Facility as viewed from the median of Interstate 80	5-60
Figure 6.1	Geographic distribution of minority census block groups near the proposed PFSF site in Skull Valley	6-23
Figure 6.2	Geographic distribution of low-income census block groups near the proposed PFSF site in Skull Valley	6-26
Figure 7.1	Possible location of an alternative spent fuel storage facility in Wyoming	7-6
Figure 7.2	Possible site for a spent fuel storage facility near Shoshoni, Wyoming	7-7
Figure 7.3	Potential cross-country rail route from the Maine Yankee nuclear power plant to Fremont County, Wyoming	7-21
Figure 7.4	Potential rail route from the Fremont County, Wyoming, site to the Utah-Nevada border	7-23

Figure 7.5	Potential rail routes for shipping spent nuclear fuel to Fremont County, Wyoming	7-24
Figure 7.6	Geographic distribution of minority census block groups within 80 km (50 miles) of the alternative site in Fremont County, Wyoming	7-26
Figure 7.7	Geographic distribution of low-income census block groups within 80 km (50 miles) of the alternative site in Fremont County, Wyoming	7-28

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table ES.1	Summary of significance levels of the combined potential impacts for the Skull Valley site alternatives xxxix
Table ES.2	Summary and comparison of potential environmental impacts xlix
Table 1.1	Site-specific reactor information for PFS member utilities 1-9
Table 1.2	Critical elements identified by BLM and considered in this DEIS 1-17
Table 2.1	Anticipated peak workforce requirements at the proposed PFSF and new rail corridor 2-5
Table 2.2	Materials to be imported and used in the construction of the proposed PFSF and the Skunk Ridge rail line 2-6
Table 2.3	Summary of water requirements during construction of the proposed PFSF . . . 2-11
Table 2.4	Potential land areas involved in construction of the proposed facility and the associated rail corridor 2-16
Table 2.5	Characteristics of the HI-STORM canister 2-23
Table 2.6	Characteristics of the HI-STORM storage cask system 2-25
Table 2.7	Best management practices as proposed by PFS during the construction of the PFSF 2-26
Table 2.8	Materials to be imported and used in the construction of an intermodal transfer facility (ITF) near Timpie, Utah 2-40
Table 3.1	Geologic time scale 3-2
Table 3.2	Types of construction materials and their quantities available in the vicinity of Skull Valley 3-8
Table 3.3	Summary of air quality for the Skull Valley area for 1995–1999 3-19
Table 3.4	Skull Valley Federal and State species of special concern expected to use or be present at or near the proposed PFSF site or alternate Site B or along the Skunk Ridge rail corridor 3-29
Table 3.5	Land in farms in the socioeconomic impact area 3-37
Table 3.6	Population in Tooele County and incorporated areas 3-40
Table 3.7	Historical population data for Tooele County 3-40
Table 3.8	Population projections for incorporated areas in Tooele County 3-40
Table 3.9	Employment and income for residents of Tooele County 3-41
Table 3.10	Employment by economic sector in Tooele County 3-41
Table 3.11	Agricultural activity in Tooele County 3-41
Table 3.12	1990 housing data for Tooele County and incorporated areas 3-44
Table 3.13	Building permits in Tooele County 3-44
Table 3.14	Educational resources in the Tooele County School District (Fall 1997) 3-45
Table 3.15	Traffic on highways potentially affected by the proposed action 3-46
Table 3.16	Monthly and daily traffic on I-80, east of Delle Interchange 3-48
Table 3.17	Generalized cultural sequence for the region including Skull Valley 3-49
Table 3.18	Average annual effective dose equivalent of ionizing radiations to a member of the U.S. population 3-55
Table 3.19	Radionuclides found in five soil samples from the proposed PFSF site 3-56

Table 3.20	Radionuclides found in vegetation and rabbit flesh as part of the Envirocare environmental study	3-56
Table 4.1	Comparison of PFSF construction material requirements with quantities of materials commercially available in the vicinity of Skull Valley	4-4
Table 4.2	Effects of site construction on PM-10 concentrations at the nearest residences	4-16
Table 4.3	Calculated doses for wildlife near the HI-STORM storage cask	4-22
Table 4.4	Potential impacts to socioeconomic and community resources during the construction of the proposed PFSF	4-28
Table 4.5	Potential impacts to socioeconomic and community resources during the operation of the proposed PFSF	4-33
Table 4.6	Estimated probabilities of fatal and nonfatal occupational injuries for the construction and operation of the proposed PFSF	4-40
Table 5.1	Comparison of transportation facility construction material requirements with quantities of materials commercially available in the vicinity of Skull Valley	5-4
Table 5.2	Seed mixture for rehabilitation of the area cleared for the rail line	5-15
Table 5.3	Potential impacts to socioeconomic and community resources during the construction and use of new transportation facilities in Skull Valley	5-21
Table 5.4	Estimated probabilities of fatal and nonfatal occupational injuries for the construction and normal operations for the proposed rail line and the ITF	5-33
Table 5.5	Annual incident-free SNF transportation doses	5-37
Table 5.6	Annual expected latent cancer fatalities (LCFs) for incident-free SNF transport	5-37
Table 5.7	Annual expected latent cancer fatalities (LCFs) for potential accident risk to the public during SNF transport	5-38
Table 5.8	Spent fuel route data as used in this analysis and in NUREG-0170	5-40
Table 5.9	Incident free dose for SNF shipment from Maine Yankee to the proposed PFSF via rail	5-45
Table 5.10	Incident free dose for SNF shipment from Maine Yankee to the proposed PFSF via an ITF near Timpie, Utah	5-46
Table 5.11	Incident free dose for SNF shipment from Maine Yankee to the ITF via rail	5-47
Table 5.12	Incident free doses for SNF shipment from the ITF to the PFSF via heavy-haul vehicle	5-48
Table 5.13	Annual and cumulative 20-year campaign radiation doses associated with SNF shipment from the proposed PFSF to the Utah-Nevada border via rail	5-50
Table 5.14	Annual and cumulative 20-year campaign radiation doses associated with intermodal SNF shipment from the PFSF to the Utah-Nevada border via an ITF near Timpie, Utah	5-51
Table 5.15	Annual and cumulative 20-year campaign health risks associated with SNF shipment from the proposed PFSF to the Utah-Nevada border via rail	5-51

Table 5.16	Annual and cumulative 20-year campaign health risks associated with intermodal SNF shipment from the proposed PFSF to the Utah-Nevada border via an ITF near Timpie, Utah	5-52
Table 5.17	Number of fires and acres burned in BLM's Salt Lake District, 1989 through 1998	5-63
Table 6.1	Summary of significance levels of the combined potential impacts for Skull Valley alternatives addressed in this DEIS	6-2
Table 6.2	Estimated fatal and nonfatal occupational injuries for the construction, normal operations, and decommissioning activities at the proposed PFSF and the Skunk Ridge rail line	6-16
Table 6.3	Estimated fatal and nonfatal occupational injuries for the construction, normal operations, and decommissioning activities at the proposed PFSF and the ITF	6-17
Table 6.4	Minority and low income block groups within 80 km (50 miles) of the preferred site	6-24
Table 6.5	Potential impacts of the proposed action on minority and low-income populations	6-28
Table 7.1	Potential host sites considered for the proposed PFSF	7-2
Table 7.2	Occurrences of species of concern in Fremont County, Wyoming, T38N R94W S23, and buffer zone	7-12
Table 7.3	Population in Fremont County and incorporated areas	7-13
Table 7.4	Doses associated with SNF shipments from the Maine Yankee reactor to the alternative site in Wyoming	7-18
Table 7.5	Radiological risks associated with SNF shipments from the Maine Yankee reactor to the alternative site in Wyoming	7-18
Table 7.6	Doses associated with SNF shipments from the alternative site in Wyoming to the Utah-Nevada border	7-19
Table 7.7	Radiological risks associated with SNF shipments from the alternative site in Wyoming to the Utah-Nevada border	7-19
Table 7.8	Data characteristics for the route from the Maine Yankee reactor to the Wyoming site	7-22
Table 7.9	Summary of the cumulative annual and 20-year campaign risks [as measured by latent cancer fatalities (LCFs)] for the shipment of spent nuclear fuel by rail to the alternative Wyoming ISFSI site	7-25
Table 7.10	Minority and low-income block groups within 80 km (50 miles) of the alternative site in Fremont County, Wyoming	7-27
Table 7.11	Summary and comparison of potential environmental impacts between an SNF storage facility at the Skull Valley, Utah, site and at the Fremont County, Wyoming site	7-30
Table 8.1	PFS's at-reactor storage cost assumptions (1999 dollars)	8-5
Table 8.2	Costs and benefits for alternative scenarios presented by PFS	8-6
Table 8.3	Sensitivity of scenario net benefits to alternative assumptions at a 7 percent discount rate	8-8
Table 9.1	Summary and comparison of potential environmental impacts	9-15

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

°C	degrees Celsius
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
μCi	micro-curies
μg	microgram
ABS	automatic block system
ACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
ACEC	areas of critical environmental concern
ADT	average daily traffic
AIRS	Aerometric Information Retrieval System
ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BLS	Bureau of Labor Statistics
BMP	best management practices
BNSF	Burlington Northern Santa Fe (Railway)
BWR	boiling-water reactor
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CESQG	Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator
CFR	<i>Code of Federal Regulations</i>
cfs	cubic feet per second
Ci	Curie
cm	centimeter
CO	carbon monoxide
CTC	centralized traffic control
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB(A)	decibels (on the A-weighted scale)
DEIS	draft environmental impact statement
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
EIS	environmental impact statement
EJ	environmental justice
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ER	environmental report
ERI	Energy Resources International

<i>Fed. Reg.</i>	<i>Federal Register</i>
FEIS	final environmental impact statement
ft	feet
FWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
g	gram
gal	gallons
gpm	gallons per minute
ha	hectare
HMP	habitat management plan
hr	hour
ICRP	International Commission on Radiological Protection
ISB	intermountain seismic belt
ISCST	Industrial Source Complex Short-Term (air dispersion model)
ISFSI	independent spent fuel storage installation
ITF	Intermodal Transfer Facility
kg	kilogram
km	kilometer
kW	kilowatt
L	liter
LCF	latent cancer fatality
L.L.C.	Limited Liability Company
LOS	level of service
m	meter
m ³	cubic meters
MEI	maximally exposed individual
MGTM	million gross ton-miles per mile
min	minute
mrem	millirem
MRS	monitored retrievable storage (facility)
MTU	metric tons of uranium
mSv	milliSievert
MWD/MTU	megawatt-days per MTU
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMSS	Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NOI	Notice of Intent
NO ₂	nitrogen oxide
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWN	Nuclear Waste Negotiator

NWPA	Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982
NWPAA	Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987
O ₃	ozone
OCA	owner-controlled area
OFF	oldest fuel first
OHV	off-highway vehicle
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Pb	lead
pCi	pico-Curies
PFS	Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C.
PFSF	Private Fuel Storage Facility
pH	a unit of measure for acidity (lower numbers) and alkalinity (higher numbers)
PM-10	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
PMF	probable maximum flood
PNL	Pacific Northwest Laboratory
ppm	parts per million
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PWR	pressurized-water reactor
R8W	Range 8 West
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RMP	resource management plan
ROD	Record of Decision
SAR	Safety Analysis Report
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
SER	Safety Evaluation Report
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SLCIA	Salt Lake City International Airport
SNF	spent nuclear fuel
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SPCC	spill prevention, control, and countermeasures
STB	U.S. Surface Transportation Board
Sv	Sievert
T5S	Township 5 South
THPO	Tribal Historic Preservation Office
TLD	thermoluminescent dosimeter
UPDES	Utah Pollution Discharge Elimination System
USC	<i>United States Code</i>
UDWR	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
VOCs	volatile organic compounds
WSA	wilderness study area
WHA	wildlife habitat area

yd³
yr

cubic yards
year